Attendees:

WEAT Voting Members:

- Doug Bingenheimer, (Team Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect - DET)
- Bud Borja (Milwaukee Co., local government representative)
- Mickey Crittenden (Rock Co., local government representative)
- Jay Jaeger (DOT, large state agency representative)

- Diane Kohn (DWD, large state agency representative)

Team Facilitator - Tekla Wlodarczyk (DET Administrator's Office, Enterprise Architect)

DET Representatives

- Max Babler (DET Operations Representative)
- Erik Mickelson (Enterprise Process Integration)
- Rob Keis (DET Security Team Leader)

- Kevin Acker (SIS Technical Lead)
- Mike Lettman (DET, Chief Information Security Officer)

Agenda

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
1	8:30	Questions Regarding SIS Documents Currently Under Review	Kevin Acker	Any questions regarding documents currently undergoing WEAT action.	No discussion on this topic.			

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
2	9:00	Overview of Upcoming Security-related Policies, Procedures and Standards for WEAT Review	Rob Keis & Mike Lettman	Presentation of an overview of upcoming security-related policies, procedures and standards for WEAT review or vote.	Rob gave an overview of the goals and process involved in creating the new security policies, procedures and standards. The documents are written to comply with ISO 17799 and NIST standards. Rob outlined the services that the security team offers and the governance and purpose of the documents. He said these are very high level and that most of these practices are already in place at DET. The handout of the presentation included summaries of each document. Rob and Mike Lettman explained the involvement of agency personnel in creating the documents; however, there was some concern by WEAT that there were only technical staff and not sufficient business-side staff involved. WEAT said that these documents may need to be reviewed by legal, human resources, the union and business related staff. Mike said this part of the review process is still being determined. WEAT asked Rob and Mike to document the principles that they used in making judgments and evaluations in creating these documents, such as why they want to be ISO and NIST compliant and the goal of protecting citizens and privacy. The team believes this type of documentation will help these documents to gain acceptance in the agencies and demonstrate why these polices, procedures and standards are important to the agencies. WEAT was concerned about the presentation and understandability of these documents for the end-user. Mike and Tekla said that they have a proposal into Matt Miszewski to have a single end-user security and appropriate use policy.	Document principles for decision making in creation of documents and send to Tekla Wlodarczyk to send to WEAT.	Rob Keis, Mike Lettman, & Tekla Wlodarczyk	ASAP

Content Contacts: DOA/DET Enterprise Architects
Doug Bingenheimer, Doug.Bingenheimer@Wisconsin.gov, 608-264-7892
Tekla Wlodarczyk, Tekla.Wlodarczyk@Wisconsin.gov, 608-266-5054

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
2	9:00	Overview of Upcoming Security-related Policies, Procedures and Standards for WEAT Review	Rob Keis & Mike Lettman	Presentation of an overview of upcoming security-related policies, procedures and standards for WEAT review or vote.	WEAT suggested that the documents be written to be technology agnostic and be sure to address the relationship of these items to any of the agencies own policies, procedures, and standards. Rob will be providing the exception process document to WEAT. Currently under creation is an Information Security Initiative Transition document which is the schedule for the implementation and transition to the new policies, procedures, and standards.	Send Exception Process to Tekla Wlodarczyk to send to WEAT.	Rob Keis & Tekla Wlodarczyk	ASAP
					WEAT decided the process for review would be to post all the drafts in one location, and conduct the official review/vote on small groups/collections of the documents as is their customary process. Having all the documents posted will allow for reference to the other documents even if they are not being reviewed at that time.	Post all draft documents for reference.	Tekla Wlodarczyk	ASAP
	10:00	BREAK						
3	110:15	"Enterprise Architecture" Versus "Technical Architecture	Jay Jaeger & Kevin Acker	Define "enterprise architecture" versus "technical architecture.	Jay Jaeger handed out a document that contains definitions for enterprise, technical, and architectural scope. He has also begun to develop some examples of what situations would fall into each scope. This is the beginning of a tool to use as a filter to communicate the types of items that should be coming through WEAT. The intent is to provide guidance and remove the ambiguity for the staff who deal in these items everyday. This will help set the limits and scope for WEAT.	Make changes to document based on discussion. Send to Tekla to send to team before next meeting.	Jay Jaeger	02/14/06
4	10:45	2006 WEAT Proactive initiatives	Tekla Wlodarczyk	1) Edit list from brainstorming 2) Select priorities 3) Begin planning	Team began refining definitions. Will continue at next meeting.	Edit document based on discussion.	Tekla Wlodarczyk	02/14/06

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
5		Other: WebSphere on OS/390	Doug Bingenheimer	Discussion on the lack of WEAT input into the decision to take WebSphere off the mainframe.	The team would like more information regarding the decision at an upcoming meeting. Though the real issue isn't with the decision, but the lack of WEAT's involvement in the decision. The team discussed the continuing trend of architectural decisions appearing to be made without WEAT input. Doug Bingenheimer said he and Tekla Wlodarczyk will be meeting with Infrastructure Support Assistant Bureau Directors Joe Rueden and Tim Herbert to discuss how to interact on matters of architecture and facilitate communication between WEAT and infrastructure support. Another issue was raised regarding the future strategic use of the mainframe. This item was added to the list of items for WEAT's Action Plan. Kevin Acker said a SIS team was working on a Web hosting document and he would see if he could expedite their progress.	Get more background on this decision and possibly have someone from Infrastructure Support appear at meeting. Check the progress of the Web hosting document and see if it can be expedited.	Doug Bingenheimer Kevin Acker	02/14/06 2/21/06
		Other: Product Selection and Procurement Process	Doug Bingenheimer	The product selection and procurement process is currently being developed by one of the SIS teams.	Doug Bingenheimer found that this process is in the development. The team discussed what their role might be in both the process itself, and the creation of the process.	Investigate the possibility of having a WEAT member on the process creation team.	Doug Bingenheimer	ASAP

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
		Other: Updates	Doug Bingenheimer	Matt Miszewski will be attending 2/21/06 WEAT meeting.	Doug Bingenheimer will be contacting WEAT members before the meeting to solicit their issues or topics of discussion for Matt.	Contact WEAT members to solicit their issues or topics of discussion for Matt.	Doug Bingenheimer	ASAP

WEAT Actions since Last Meeting 01/24/06

Date Completed	Item	Description	Next Steps
01/26/06	Review #2	1) 63 V_02 Support Tools Recommendation - Remote Access 120105.doc 2) 65 V_01 Server Virtualization Standard.doc	Review concluded. Comments sent to document authors. Following revisions, this will go to WEAT vote.
02/06/06	Review #3	67 V_02 Clustering Recommendation - Review Only	Review due February 6.
02/02/06	Vote #8	Voting on 26 V.04 SAN Configuration Technical Design based on revisions suggested by WEAT.	Vote due February 2.
01/10/06	Vote #9	Voting on 34 Oracle Instance Sharing Standard During Migration V.03	Vote due February

Items To Bring To CIO

Item	Description	Next Steps	Responsible Party	Due Date
Product Selection Process	Find out more about the technology selection process or strategic procurement process.	Ask Matt for his views/guidance on WEAT's role.	Doug Bingenheimer	Undermined
DET's Core Competencies	Do we know what DET's core competencies are, or is there is some effort underway to document these?	Ask Matt.	Doug Bingenheimer	Undermined

Outstanding Items

Item	Description	Next Steps	Responsible Party	Due Date

Item	Description	Next Steps	Responsible Party	Due Date
WEAT Membership	Fill vacancies. • Doug Bingenheimer (CEA - DET representative - only votes to break ties) • Mickey Crittenden (Rock Co., local government representative) • Bud Borja (Milw Co, local government representative) • Jay Jaeger (DOT, large state agency representative) • Diane Kohn (DWD, large state agency representative) • Keith Hazelton (UW representative) • Judy Heil (DET customer service rep) • DET operations architect rep (vacancy) • Small agency rep (vacancy) • Small agency rep (vacancy) • Applications management rep (vacancy)	• Identify nominees • Obtain approval from candidate's agency • Appointment by CIO	Doug Bingenheimer	Current work
Extranet for WEAT	If WEAT is to truly have an extended enterprise focus then the WEAT information needs to be available to the extended enterprise.	• Research options / needs in context of website content publishing project (see improvements plan) • Identify if this is currently possible.	Tekla Wlodarczyk	February
Possible need for a formalized forum within WEAT process for review and comment by agencies / stakeholders	One issue regarding WEAT's role is that there is no other formalized forum for review or comment by agencies / stakeholders. This type of review should be worked into the process in the future.	• Develop the desired process / workflow. • Publish process • Communicate Process availability (Push info?)	Tekla Wlodarczyk	Long-term

Future Agenda Items

Suggested Meeting Date	Item	Contact	Description
February – 2nd meeting	WEAT's Role in Review of Agency Strategic Plans	Doug Bingenheimer	Need to determine what WEAT's role: 1) Should WEAT be involved in reviewing and perhaps recommending action to the CIO on the agencies' strategic plans and 2) WEAT review to identify multi agency needs / enterprise opportunities and input into things that might be on WEAT's proactive agenda. NOTE: Actual strategic plan requirements from DET have not yet been finalized.
April – 1st meeting	NT 4 & Exchange 5.5	Max Babler	Discuss issues regarding continuing need for support / maintenance – plan for this sunset technology
February	Informational Filing	Jay Jaeger	A question was raised that outside of SIS, how will WEAT find out about efforts/projects occurring that will have a strategic impact on enterprise architecture. WEAT suggested developing an "informational filing" process in which as a part planning projects that met a certain criteria, the project team would complete information on some type of form and submit to WEAT.